

REMARKS

The Examiner requires a new, more descriptive title. Accordingly, a new title has been provided.

Claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 16-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as clearly anticipated by Burkhardt. Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Burkhardt. It is noted that "Unix" is evidently not applied to the claims.

The presently claimed invention provides an apparatus for communication between a plurality of processor devices. There is provided a post office memory including a plurality of mailbox memories. Each of the mailbox memories is write accessible at any time only by a corresponding owner processor device, and is read-accessible by the corresponding owner processor device and other processor devices of the plurality of processor devices at times determined independently of a write access. The processor devices include a transmitting processor device and a receiving processor device. A mailbox memory corresponding to the transmitting processor device contains information to be transferred to the receiving processor device. The transmitting processor device is determined prior to the receiving processor reading the information to be transferred. Claims 13, 22 and 23 have been amended to recite similar features or steps.

Burkhardt discloses an array of mailbox locations associated with processors. A transmitting processor inserts a message to be transferred into its mailbox along with the address of the other processor. The sending processor then interrupts the receiving processor. In response to the interrupt, the receiving processor scans the mailboxes to find the mailbox with its address so that it can receive the message.

Applicants' previous arguments regarding Burkhardt and its disadvantages are incorporated herein. Without repeating the arguments, it is noted that Burkhardt's polling of mailbox

locations (see Col. 3, lines 13-18) to determine the transmitting processor device is simply contrary to the presently claimed invention. In the presently claimed invention, the mailboxes are not scanned in order to determine the receiving processor. As explained in the specification, the present invention requires fewer lines, resulting in a smaller chip. Moreover, not scanning all mailboxes significantly reduces the time required for this operation.

It is believed that the amendments do not present any new issues requiring further search or consideration. For example, the amendments clarify the order of the steps, and the "information", which without amendment is inferentially claimed. Also, claim 1 incorporates certain language canceled from or present in claim 2. Further, claim 1 as amended recites the order of the determining of the transmitting processor device, which is recited in claims 13 and 22 as described above.

A Petition for Extension of Time is enclosed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinguished over the references and are now in form for allowance. Early notification of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 5, 1996
Date

Cynthia K. Nicholson
Cynthia K. Nicholson
Reg. No. 36,880

FOLEY & LARDNER
Suite 500, 3000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109
(202) 672-5300